arXiv:1506.02234v3 [math.GR] 28 Dec 2015

Automorphisms of metacyclic groups

Haimiao Chen [*]
Mathematics, Beijing Technology and Business University, Beijing, China
Yueshan Xiong [†]
Mathematics, Capital Normal University, Beijing, China
Zhongjian Zhu [‡]
Institute of Mathematics, Chinese Academy of Science, Beijing, China

Abstract

Let H be a metacyclic group which can be presented as $\langle a, b \mid a^n = e, b^m = a^t, bab^{-1} = a^r\rangle$ for some n, m, t, r. Each endomorphism of H is given by $\sigma : a \mapsto a^{x_1}b^{y_1}, b \mapsto a^{x_2}b^{y_2}$ for some integers x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2. We find sufficient and necessary conditions on x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 for σ to be an automorphism, so as to determine all automorphisms of H.

Keywords: automorphism, metacyclic group, congruence equation.
MSC 2010: 20D45.

1 Introduction

A finite group G is *metacyclic* if it contains a cyclic, normal subgroup N such that G/N is also cyclic. Metacyclic groups form an interesting family of groups, in that they are the simplest ones other than abelian groups.

As a natural object, the automorphism group of a metacyclic group has been widely studied. In 1970, Davitt [4] shaw that if G is a metacyclic p-group with $p \neq 2$, then the order of $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$ is divided by that of G. In 2006, Bidwell and Curran [1] found the order and the structure of $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$ when G is a split metacyclic p-group with $p \neq 2$, and in 2007, Curran [2] obtained similar results for split metacyclic 2-groups. In 2008, Curran [3] determined $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$ when G is a non-split metacyclic p-group with $p \neq 2$. In 2009, Golasiński and Gonçalves [5] determined $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$ for any split metacyclic group G. The automorphism groups of non-split metacyclic 2-groups are left unknown, let alone general cases.

For abelian groups, all automorphisms were determined by Hillar and Rhea [7] in 2007. In this paper, we aim to explicitly write down all of the automorphisms for a general metacyclic group; this should help people understand the automorphism group better.

---

[*] Email: *chenhm@math.pku.edu.cn*
[†] Email: *xiongyueshan@gmail.com*
[‡] Email: *zhuzhongjianzzj@126.com*

It is well-known (see Section 3.7 of [8]) that each metacyclic group can be presented as

$$\langle a, b \mid a^n = e, b^m = a^t, bab^{-1} = a^r \rangle. \tag{1}$$

for some positive integers n, m, r, t satisfying

$$r^m - 1 \equiv t(r-1) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}. \tag{2}$$

Denote this group by $H = H(n, m; t, r)$. There is an extension

$$1 \to \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \to H \to \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z} \to 1$$

where $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \cong \langle a \rangle \lhd H$ and $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z} \cong H/\langle a \rangle$. It may happen that two groups given by different values of n, m, t, r are isomorphic. A complete classification (up to isomorphism) for finite metacyclic groups was obtained by Hempel [6] in 2000.

In the presentation (1), we may assume $t \mid n$ which we do from now on. To see this, choose u, v such that $un + vt = (n, t)$, then $(v, n/(n, t)) = 1$. Let w be the product of all prime factors of m that do not divide v and let $v' = v + wn/(n, t)$, then $(v', m) = 1$. Replacing b by $\check{b} = b^{v'}$, we get another presentation: $H = \langle a, \check{b} \mid a^n = e, \check{b}^m = a^{(n,t)}, \check{b}a\check{b}^{-1} = a^{r^{v'}} \rangle$.

Obviously each element can be written as $a^u b^v$; note that $a^u b^v = e$ if and only if $m \mid v$ and $n \mid (u + tv/m)$. Each automorphism $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(H)$ is determined by $\sigma(a) = a^{x_1} b^{y_1}, \sigma(b) = a^{x_2} b^{y_2}$ for some integers x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2. The main result of this paper gives sufficient and necessary conditions on x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, for σ to be an automorphism. They consist of two parts, ensuring σ to be invertible and well-defined, respectively. Skillfully using elementary number theoretical techniques, we manage to reduce the second part to linear congruence equations. It turns out that the situation concerning the prime 2 is quite subtle, and this reflects the difficulty in determining the automorphism groups of metacyclic 2-groups.

2 Determining all automorphisms

2.1 Preparation

Notation 2.1. For an integer $n > 0$, let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ denote $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$, and also regard it as a quotient ring of $\mathbb{Z}$. For $u \in \mathbb{Z}$, denote its image under the quotient $\mathbb{Z} \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_n$ also by u.

For integers u, s with $u \geq 0$, set $[u]_s = \begin{cases} 1 + s + \cdots + s^{u-1}, & u > 0, \\ 0, & u = 0. \end{cases}$

For a prime number p and an integer $u > 0$, let $\deg_p(u)$ denote the largest integer s with $p^s \mid u$; set $\deg_p(0) = +\infty$ for convenience.

Denote a^u by $\exp_a(u)$ when the expression for u is too long.

Lemma 2.2. *If $s > 1$ with $\deg_p(s-1) = \ell > 1$ and $x > 0$ with $\deg_p(x) = u > 0$, then*

(I) $[x]_s \equiv \begin{cases} x, & p \neq 2, \\ (1 + 2^{\ell-1})x, & p = 2 \end{cases} \pmod{p^{\ell+u}}$.

$$\text{(II)}\ \ s^x - 1 \equiv \begin{cases} (s-1)x, & p \neq 2, \\ (s-1+2^{2\ell-1})x, & p = 2 \end{cases} \pmod{p^{2\ell+u}}.$$

Proof. We only prove (I), then (II) follows immediately from the identity $(s-1)[u]_s = s^u - 1$.

Write $s = 1 + p^\ell \mu$ with $p \nmid \mu$, then

$$\begin{aligned} [p^u]_s &= \sum_{i=0}^{p^u-1} (1+p^\ell\mu)^i = \sum_{i=0}^{p^u-1}\sum_{j=0}^{i} \binom{i}{j} (p^\ell\mu)^j = \sum_{j=1}^{p^u} (p^\ell\mu)^{j-1} \binom{p^u}{j} \\ &\equiv \begin{cases} p^u, & p \neq 2, \\ 2^u(1+2^{\ell-1}), & p = 2 \end{cases} \pmod{p^{\ell+u}}, \end{aligned}$$

using

$$\begin{aligned} \deg_p\left(\binom{p^u}{j}\right) &= \deg_p\left(\frac{(p^u)!}{j!(p^u-j+1)!}\right) = \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \deg_p(p^u - i) - \sum_{i=1}^{j} \deg_p(i) \\ &= u - \deg_p(j) \geq u - (j-2)\ell = (\ell+u) - (j-1)\ell \end{aligned}$$

for all $\begin{cases} j \geq 2, & p \neq 2, \\ j \geq 3, & p = 2 \end{cases}$ and $(2^u - 1)\mu \equiv 1 \pmod 2$ when $p = 2$.

Thus $s^{p^u} = (s-1)[p^u]_s \equiv 1 \pmod{p^k}$; writing $x = p^u x'$ with $p \nmid x'$, we have

$$[x]_s = [p^u]_s \left(\sum_{j=0}^{x'-1} (s^{p^u})^j \right) = [p^u]_s \cdot x' \equiv \begin{cases} x, & p \neq 2, \\ (1+2^{\ell-1})x, & p = 2 \end{cases} \pmod{p^{\ell+u}}.$$

$\square$

2.2 The method

It follows from (1) that

$$b^v a^u = a^{r^v u} b^v, \tag{3}$$

$$(a^{u_1}b^{v_1})(a^{u_2}b^{v_2}) = a^{u_1 + r^{v_1}u_2} b^{v_1+v_2}, \tag{4}$$

$$(a^u b^v)^k = a^{u[k]_r} b^{vk}, \tag{5}$$

$$[a^{u_1}b^{v_1}, a^{u_2}b^{v_2}] = \exp_a((r^{v_1}-1)u_2 - (r^{v_2}-1)u_1), \tag{6}$$

where the notation $[g,h] = ghg^{-1}h^{-1}$ for commutator is adopted.

In view of (6), the commutator subgroup $[H,H]$ is generated by a^{r-1}. The abelianization $H^{\mathrm{ab}} := H/[H,H]$ has a presentation

$$\langle \overline{a}, \overline{b} \mid d\overline{a} = 0, m\overline{b} = t\overline{a} \rangle, \qquad \text{with } \ d = (r-1, n), \tag{7}$$

where additive notation is used and $\overline{a} + \overline{b} = \overline{b} + \overline{a}$ is implicitly assumed.

Lemma 2.3. *There exists a homomorphism* $\sigma : H \to H$ *with* $\sigma(a) = a^{x_1}b^{y_1}$, $\sigma(b) = a^{x_2}b^{y_2}$ *if and only if*

$$(d,t)y_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{m}, \tag{8}$$

$$x_2[m]_{r^{y_2}} + ty_2 - x_1[t]_{r^{y_1}} - \frac{ty_1}{m}t \equiv 0 \pmod{n}, \tag{9}$$

$$(r^{y_1}-1)x_2 + ([r]_{r^{y_1}} - r^{y_2})x_1 + \frac{(r-1)y_1}{m}t \equiv 0 \pmod{n}. \tag{10}$$

Proof. Sufficient and necessary conditions for σ to be well-defined are:

$$\begin{aligned} e = \sigma(a)^n &= a^{x_1[n]_{r^{y_1}}}b^{y_1 n}, \\ a^{x_2[m]_{r^{y_2}}}b^{y_2 m} = \sigma(b)^m &= \sigma(a)^t = a^{x_1[t]_{r^{y_1}}}b^{y_1 t}, \\ a^{x_2}b^{y_2}a^{x_1}b^{y_1}b^{-y_2}a^{-x_2} = \sigma(b)\sigma(a)\sigma(b)^{-1} &= \sigma(a)^r = a^{x_1[r]_{r^{y_1}}}b^{y_1 r}; \end{aligned}$$

equivalently,

$$m \mid ny_1, \quad x_1[n]_{r^{y_1}} + \frac{ny_1}{m}t \equiv 0 \pmod{n}, \tag{11}$$

$$m \mid ty_1, \quad x_2[m]_{r^{y_2}} + y_2 t \equiv x_1[t]_{r^{y_1}} + \frac{ty_1}{m}t \pmod{n}, \tag{12}$$

$$m \mid (r-1)y_1, \quad x_2(1-r^{y_1}) + x_1 r^{y_2} \equiv x_1[r]_{r^{y_1}} + \frac{(r-1)y_1}{m}t \pmod{n}. \tag{13}$$

The first halves of (11), (12), (13) are equivalent to the single one $m \mid (d,t)y_1$. Then the second half of (11) can be omitted: for each prime divisor p of n, if $p \mid r^{y_1}-1$, then by Lemma 2.2 (I), $\deg_p([n]_{r^{y_1}}) \geq \alpha_p$; otherwise, since $r^{ny_1}-1$ can be divided by $r^m - 1$ which is a multiple of n, we also have $\deg_p([n]_{r^{y_1}}) = \deg_p(r^{ny_1}-1) \geq \alpha_p$. $\square$

Let Λ denote the set of prime divisors of nm, and for each $p \in \Lambda$, denote

$$\alpha_p = \deg_p(n), \quad \beta_p = \deg_p(m), \quad \gamma_p = \deg_p(t), \quad \delta_p = \deg_p(r-1). \tag{14}$$

Subdivide $\Lambda = \Lambda_1 \sqcup \Lambda_2 \sqcup \Lambda'$, with

$$\Lambda_1 = \{p\colon \alpha_p, \delta_p > 0\}, \quad \Lambda_2 = \{p\colon \alpha_p > \delta_p = 0\}, \quad \Lambda' = \{p\colon \alpha_p = 0\}. \tag{15}$$

Denote

$$\epsilon = \deg_2(r+1). \tag{16}$$

It follows from $t(r-1) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ that

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_p - \delta_p \leq \gamma_p \leq \alpha_p, & p \in \Lambda_1, \\ \gamma_p = \alpha_p, & p \in \Lambda_2, \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

and it follows from $r^m - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ and Lemma 2.2 (II) that

$$\text{for each } p \in \Lambda_1, \qquad \begin{cases} \delta_p + \beta_p \geq \alpha_p, & (p, \delta_p) \neq (2,1) \text{ or } (p, \delta_p, \beta_p) = (2,1,0), \\ \epsilon + \beta_2 \geq \alpha_2, & \delta_2 = 1 \text{ and } \beta_2 > 0. \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

The condition (8) is equivalent to

$$\min\{\delta_p, \gamma_p\} + \deg_p(y_1) \geq \beta_p \qquad \text{for all } p \in \Lambda. \tag{19}$$

Since H is finite, σ is invertible if and only if it is injective; equivalently, (i) the induced homomorphism $\overline{\sigma} : H^{\mathrm{ab}} \to H^{\mathrm{ab}}$ determined by $\overline{a} \mapsto x_1\overline{a} + y_1\overline{b}$, $\overline{b} \mapsto x_2\overline{a} + y_2\overline{b}$ is injective, and (ii) the restriction $\sigma|_{[H,H]}$ is injective.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\delta_p^0 = \min\{\alpha_p, \delta_p\} = \deg_p(d)$. The homomorphism $\overline{\sigma}$ is injective if and only if*

$$\begin{cases} p \nmid y_2, & p \in \Lambda', \\ p \nmid x_1, & p \in \Lambda_1,\ \beta_p = 0, \\ p \nmid x_1y_2 - x_2y_1, & p \in \Lambda_1,\ \beta_p > 0. \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

Proof. For each $p \in \Lambda' \sqcup \Lambda_1$, let

$$H_p^{\mathrm{ab}} = \langle \overline{a}_p, \overline{b}_p \rangle, \qquad \text{with} \quad \overline{a}_p = \frac{d}{p^{\delta_p^0}}\overline{a}, \quad \overline{b}_p = \frac{m}{p^{\beta_p}}\overline{b},$$

then $\overline{\sigma}$ is injective if and only if $\overline{\sigma}_p = \overline{\sigma}|_{H_p^{\mathrm{ab}}}$ is injective for all p. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\sigma}_p(\overline{a}_p) &= \overline{\sigma}\left(\frac{d}{p^{\delta_p^0}}\overline{a}\right) = \frac{d}{p^{\delta_p^0}}(x_1\overline{a} + y_1\overline{b}) = x_1\overline{a}_p + \frac{dy_1p^{\beta}}{mp^{\delta_p^0}}\overline{b}_p, \\ \overline{\sigma}_p(\overline{b}_p) &= \overline{\sigma}\left(\frac{m}{p^{\beta_p}}\overline{b}\right) = \frac{m}{p^{\beta_p}}(x_2\overline{a} + y_2\overline{b}) = \frac{m}{p^{\beta_p}}wx_2 \cdot \overline{a}_p + y_2\overline{b}_p, \end{aligned}$$

where w is some integer with $wd/p^{\delta_p^0} \equiv 1 \pmod{p^{\delta_p^0}}$.

If $p \in \Lambda'$, i.e., $\delta_p^0 = 0$, then $H_p^{\mathrm{ab}} = \langle \overline{b}_p \rangle$, and it is easy to see that σ_p is injective if and only if $p \nmid y_2$. If $p \in \Lambda_1$ with $\beta_p = 0$, then $H_p^{\mathrm{ab}} = \langle \overline{a}_p \rangle$, and it is easy to see that σ_p is injective if and only if $p \nmid x_1$. If $p \in \Lambda_1$ with $\beta_p > 0$, then by Theorem 3.6 of [7], $\overline{\sigma}_p$ is injective if and only if

$$p \nmid x_1y_2 - \frac{dy_1p^{\beta}}{mp^{\delta_p^0}}\frac{m}{p^{\beta_p}}wx_2 \equiv x_1y_2 - x_2y_1 \pmod{p}.$$

□

Now consider the injectivity of $\sigma|_{[H,H]}$. Note that for each $p \in \Lambda_1$ with $\delta_p < \alpha_p$, $r^{y_1} - 1 \equiv (r-1)y_1$ and $r^{y_2} - 1 \equiv (r-1)y_2 \pmod{p^{2\delta_p}}$, hence

$$(r^{y_1} - 1)x_2 - (r^{y_2} - 1)x_1 \equiv (r-1)(x_2y_1 - x_1y_2) \pmod{p^{2\delta_p}},$$

which together with (20) implies $\deg_p((r^{y_1}-1)x_2-(r^{y_2}-1)x_1)=\delta_p$. Thus $\sigma|_{[H,H]}$ is injective if and only if

$$\deg_p((r^{y_1}-1)x_2-(r^{y_2}-1)x_1)=\delta_p \quad \text{for all } p\in\Lambda_2. \tag{21}$$

Summarizing, sufficient and necessary conditions for there to be an automorphism σ with $\sigma(a)=a^{x_1}b^{y_1}$, $\sigma(b)=a^{x_2}b^{y_2}$ are (8), (9), (10), (20) and (21). The main task in the remainder of this section is, assuming (8) and (20), to simplify (9), (10) and (21).

Let $(9)_p$ (resp. $(10)_p$) denote the condition (9) (resp. (10)) with mod n replaced by mod p^{α_p}, then (9) (resp. (10)) is equivalent to $(9)_p$ (resp. $(10)_p$) for all $p\in\Lambda_1\sqcup\Lambda_2$ simultaneously.

If $p\in\Lambda_1$ with $\delta_p\geq\alpha_p$, then $r\equiv 1 \pmod{p^{\alpha_p}}$, hence $(10)_p$ is trivial, and $(9)_p$ becomes

$$t(x_1+\frac{ty_1}{m}-y_2)\equiv mx_2 \pmod{p^{\alpha_p}}.$$

We shall discuss the cases $p\in\Lambda_2$ and $p\in\Lambda_1$ with $\delta_p<\alpha_p$, respectively.

2.3 $p\in\Lambda_2$

Lemma 2.5. *If $p\in\Lambda_2$, then $p\neq 2$, and the conditions $(9)_p$, $(10)_p$ hold if and only if $r^{y_1}\equiv 1$ and $r^{y_2}\equiv r \pmod{p^{\alpha_p}}$.*

Proof. If $p=2$, then $2\mid n$ and $2\mid r$, contradicting to $n\mid r^m-1$. Hence $p\neq 2$.

Just write $x=y$ if $x\equiv y \pmod{p^{\alpha_p}}$. Due to (17), we may convert $(9)_p$ and $(10)_p$ into

$$x_2[m]_{r^{y_2}}-x_1[t]_{r^{y_1}}=0, \tag{22}$$

$$(r^{y_1}-1)x_2+([r]_{r^{y_1}}-r^{y_2})x_1=0. \tag{23}$$

The second equation implies

$$rx_1[r-1]_{r^{y_1}}+(r^{y_1}-1)x_2-(r^{y_2}-1)x_1=0,$$

which together with (21) implies $p\nmid x_1[r-1]_{r^{y_1}}$. Then since

$$(r^{y_1}-1)[r-1]_{r^{y_1}}=r^{(r-1)y_1}-1=(r^m)^{(r-1)y_1/m}-1=0,$$

we have $r^{y_1}\equiv 1 \pmod{p^{\alpha_p}}$. Now (23) becomes $(r^{y_2}-r)x_1=0$, so $r^{y_2}=r$. Consequently, $[m]_{r^{y_2}}=[m]_r=0$ and $[t]_{r^{y_1}}=t=0$, hence (22) automatically holds. □

Remark 2.6. It is appropriate to point out that (21) is equivalent to $p\nmid x_1$ for all $p\in\Lambda_2$.

2.4 $p\in\Lambda_1$, $\delta_p<\alpha_p$

In this case, we have $\beta_p>0$ by (18). In the proofs, we abbreviate $\alpha_p,\beta_p,\gamma_p,\delta_p,\deg_p(x)$ to $\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta,\deg(x)$, respectively.

2.4.1 $p \neq 2$

Lemma 2.7. *If $2 \neq p \in \Lambda_1$, then $(9)_p$ and $(10)_p$ hold if and only if*

$$mx_2 \equiv t(x_1 + \frac{ty_1}{m} - y_2) \pmod{p^{\alpha_p}}, \tag{24}$$

$$y_2 \equiv 1 + \frac{ty_1}{m} \pmod{p^{\alpha_p - \delta_p}}. \tag{25}$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.2, the following identities hold in $\mathbb{Z}_{p^\alpha}$:

$$r^{y_1} = 1 + (r-1)y_1, \quad [r]_{r^{y_1}} = r, \quad [t]_{r^{y_1}} = t, \quad [m]_{r^{y_2}} = m,$$

hence we can simplify $(9)_p$ into (24) and rewrite $(10)_p$ as

$$(r-1)y_1x_2 - (r^{y_2} - r)x_1 + \frac{(r-1)y_1}{m}t \equiv 0 \pmod{p^\alpha}. \tag{26}$$

Since by (19), $\deg(y_1) \geq \beta - \delta \geq \alpha - 2\delta$, and by (17), $\deg(ty_1/m) = \deg(y_1) + \gamma - \beta \geq \alpha - 2\delta$, it follows from (26) that

$$\deg(y_2 - 1) = \deg((r^{y_2} - r)) - \delta - \deg(x_1) \geq \alpha - 2\delta - \deg(x_1).$$

Then by Lemma 2.2 (II), $r^{y_2 - 1} - 1 \equiv (y_2 - 1)(r - 1) \pmod{p^{\alpha - \deg(x_1)}}$, and hence, using $(r-1)^2(y_2 - 1)x_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p^\alpha}$, we obtain

$$(r^{y_2} - r)x_1 \equiv (y_2 - 1)(r-1)rx_1 \equiv (y_2 - 1)(r-1)x_1 \pmod{p^\alpha}.$$

Thus (26) can be converted into

$$(y_2 - 1)x_1 \equiv x_2y_1 + \frac{ty_1}{m} \pmod{p^{\alpha - \delta}}. \tag{27}$$

Finally, (27) and (24) lead to (25):

$$\begin{aligned} & (y_2 - 1 - \frac{ty_1}{m})(x_1 + \frac{ty_1}{m}) \\ = {} & (y_2 - 1)x_1 + (y_2 - 1 - x_1 - \frac{ty_1}{m})\frac{ty_1}{m} \\ \equiv {} & x_2y_1 + (y_2 - x_1 - \frac{ty_1}{m})\frac{ty_1}{m} \pmod{p^{\alpha-\delta}} \qquad \text{(by (27))} \\ = {} & \frac{y_1}{m}(mx_2 + ty_2 - tx_1 - \frac{ty_1}{m}t) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{\alpha-\delta}} \qquad \text{(by (24))}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we use $\alpha + \deg(y_1) - \beta \geq \alpha - \delta$. $\square$

2.4.2 $p = 2$

Set

$$\mu(y_1) = \begin{cases} 2^{\alpha_2-\delta_2-1}, & \gamma_2 \neq \beta_2,\ \min\{\beta_2,\gamma_2\} = \alpha_2 - \delta_2 \text{ and } \deg_2(y_1) = \beta_2 - \delta_2, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{28}$$

Lemma 2.8. *Suppose $2 \in \Lambda_1$. The conditions $(9)_2$ and $(10)_2$ hold if and only if*

(i) *If $\delta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$ (so that $\alpha_2 = 2$) and $\beta_2 > 1$, then $\deg_2(y_1) \geq \beta_2$;*

(ii) *if $\delta_2 = 1$ and $\gamma_2 > 1$, then $2 \mid y_1$, $\deg_2(x_2) \geq \alpha_2 - \beta_2 - \epsilon + 1$ and*

$$2^{\epsilon}(y_1 - y_2 + 1) \equiv \frac{2y_1}{m}t \pmod{2^{\alpha_2}}; \tag{29}$$

(iii) *if $\delta_2 > 1$, then*

$$mx_2 \equiv t(x_1 + \frac{ty_1}{m} - y_2) \pmod{2^{\alpha_2}}, \tag{30}$$

$$y_2 \equiv 1 + \frac{ty_1}{m} + \mu(y_1) \pmod{2^{\alpha_2-\delta_2}}. \tag{31}$$

Proof. (i) If $\beta > 1$, then $2 \mid y_1$, hence $2 \nmid x_1y_2$ and $r^{y_1} \equiv -r^{y_2} \equiv 1 \pmod 4$; it is easy to check that $(9)_2$ and $(10)_2$ hold if and only if $\deg(y_1) \geq \beta$.

If $\beta = 1$, then since in $\mathbb{Z}_4$,

$$r^{y_1} = 1 + 2y_1, \quad r^{y_2} = 1 + 2y_2, \quad [m]_{r^{y_2}} = 2 + 2y_2, \quad [t]_{r^{y_1}} = [r-1]_{r^{y_1}} = 2 + 2y_1,$$

we may rewrite $(9)_2$ and $(10)_2$ as, respectively,

$$x_2(2 + 2y_2) + 2y_2 - x_1(2 + 2y_1) - 2y_1 = 0,$$
$$2y_1x_2 + (2y_1 - 2 - 2y_2)x_1 + 2y_1 = 0;$$

they can be verified to be true under the assumption $2 \nmid x_1y_2 - x_2y_1$.

(ii) We first show $2 \mid y_1$. Assume on the contrary that $2 \nmid y_1$. Then $\beta = 1$ by (19), $2 \mid x_2$ by $(9)_2$, and $2 \nmid x_1y_2$ by (20). By (18), $\deg(r^2 - 1) = \epsilon + 1 \geq \alpha$, hence in $\mathbb{Z}_{2^\alpha}$ we have

$$r^2 = 1, \qquad r^{y_1} = r^{y_2} = r, \qquad [r]_{r^{y_1}} = 1 + \frac{r^2-1}{2}.$$

But $(10)_2$ implies $x_1(r-1)^2/2 \equiv 0 \pmod 4$, which is impossible.

So $2 \mid y_1$, $2 \nmid x_1y_2$, and hence $t(x_1 - y_2) \equiv 0 \pmod{2^\alpha}$.

By (18), (19), $1 + \epsilon + \deg(y_1) \geq \alpha$, hence

$$\deg(r^{y_1} - 1) = \deg((r^2)^{\frac{y_1}{2}} - 1) = \epsilon + 1 + \deg(y_1) - 1 \geq \alpha - 1.$$

Applying Lemma 2.2, we obtain the following identities in $\mathbb{Z}_{2^\alpha}$:

$$\begin{aligned} r^{y_1} &= (1+(r^2-1))^{\frac{y_1}{2}} = 1+(r^2-1)\cdot\frac{y_1}{2} = 1+(r+1)y_1, \\ [t]_{r^{y_1}} &= t(1+2^{\epsilon+\deg(y_1)-1}) = t, \\ [r]_{r^{y_1}} &= r^{(r-1)y_1}+[r-1]_{r^{y_1}} = 1+(r-1)(1+2^{\epsilon+\deg(y_1)-1}) = r+(r+1)y_1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $t^2y_1/m \equiv 0 \pmod{2^\alpha}$, $(9)_2$ becomes $x_2[m]_{r^{y_2}} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^\alpha}$, which is equivalent to

$$\deg(x_2)+\beta+\epsilon-1 \geq \alpha,$$

where we have used $\deg(r^{y_2}+1)=\epsilon$. Consequently

$$\deg((r^{y_1}-1)x_2) = \deg(y_1)+\epsilon+\deg(x_2) \geq \beta-1+\epsilon+\deg(x_2) \geq \alpha,$$

hence $(10)_2$ becomes

$$r^{y_2}-r \equiv (r+1)y_1+\frac{(r-1)y_1}{m}t \pmod{2^\alpha}. \tag{32}$$

Since $\epsilon+\deg(y_1) \geq \alpha-1$ and $\deg((r-1)y_1t/m) = 1+\deg(y_1)+\gamma-\beta \geq \alpha-1$, we have $\deg(r^{y_2}-r) \geq \alpha-1$, hence $r^{y_2}-r \equiv (r+1)(y_2-1) \pmod{2^\alpha}$, and (32) is equivalent to (29).

(iii) In this case, $2\delta+\deg(y_1) \geq \alpha$ and the following holds in $\mathbb{Z}_{2^\alpha}$:

$$\begin{aligned} r^{y_1} &= \begin{cases} 1+(r-1)y_1, & 2\nmid y_1, \\ 1+(r-1+2^{2\delta-1})y_1, & 2\mid y_1, \end{cases} & [r]_{r^{y_1}} &= r+2^{2\delta-1}y_1, \\ [t]_{r^{y_1}} &= t(1+2^{\delta-1}y_1), & [m]_{r^{y_2}} &= m(1+2^{\delta-1}y_2). \end{aligned}$$

By $(10)_2$, $x_1y_2-x_2y_1 \equiv x_1+ty_1/m \pmod 2$, hence

$$2\nmid x_1+\frac{ty_1}{m}. \tag{33}$$

(iii-1) If $2\mid y_1$, then $2\nmid x_1y_2$ by (20), and $2\mid ty_1/m$ by (33). The condition $(9)_2$ becomes

$$(1+2^{\delta-1}y_2)mx_2-t(x_1+\frac{ty_1}{m}-y_2) \equiv 0 \pmod{2^\alpha}, \tag{34}$$

which can be converted into (30) via multiplying $1-2^{\delta-1}y_2$, using (17) and $2\mid x_1+ty_1/m-y_2$. Moreover, (34) implies $\beta+\deg(x_2) \geq \min\{\gamma+1,\alpha\}$, hence $2\delta-1+\deg(x_2)+\deg(y_1) \geq \alpha$. Consequently, $(10)_2$ becomes

$$(r-1)x_2y_1+2^{2\delta-1}y_1+(r-r^{y_2})x_1+\frac{(r-1)y_1}{m}t \equiv 0 \pmod{2^\alpha}. \tag{35}$$

Similarly as in the proof of Lemma 2.7, we obtain $\deg(y_2-1) \geq \alpha-2\delta$, and then by Lemma 2.2 (II), $r^{y_2}-r \equiv (r-1)(y_2-1)(1+2^{\delta-1}) \pmod{2^\alpha}$. Hence (35) can be converted into

$$(y_2-1)x_1 \equiv x_2y_1+\frac{ty_1}{m}+2^{\delta-1}(y_1-y_2+1) \pmod{2^{\alpha-\delta}}, \tag{36}$$

$$\text{i.e.,} \qquad (x_1+2^{\delta-1})(y_1-y_2+1) \equiv (x_1-x_2)y_1+\frac{ty_1}{m} \pmod{2^{\alpha-\delta}},$$

so $\deg(y_1-y_2+1)=\alpha-2\delta$ if and only if one of the following cases occurs:

- $\deg(y_1) > \deg(ty_1/m) = \alpha - 2\delta$,
- $\deg(ty_1/m) > \deg(y_1) = \alpha - 2\delta$ and $2 \mid x_2$,
- $\deg(ty_1/m) = \deg(y_1) = \alpha - 2\delta$ and $2 \nmid x_2$.

In light of (17), (18), (19) and (30), the first case is equivalent to $\gamma = \alpha - \delta$, $\deg(y_1) = \beta - \delta$ and $\beta > \gamma$; the second case is equivalent to $\deg(y_1) + \delta = \beta = \alpha - \delta$ and $\gamma > \beta$; the third case is impossible, since it would imply $\beta = \gamma = \alpha - \delta$, which contradicts to (30).

Rephrasing, $\deg(y_1 - y_2 + 1) = \alpha - 2\delta$ if and only if

$$\deg(y_1) = \beta - \delta, \quad \gamma \neq \beta \quad \text{and} \quad \min\{\beta, \gamma\} = \alpha - \delta. \tag{37}$$

Thus (36) is equivalent to

$$(y_2 - 1)x_1 \equiv x_2 y_1 + \frac{ty_1}{m} + \mu(y_1) \pmod{2^{\alpha-\delta}}. \tag{38}$$

Similarly as in the proof of Lemma 2.7,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(y_2 - 1 - \frac{ty_1}{m})(x_1 + \frac{ty_1}{m}) \\
=\ &(y_2 - 1)x_1 + (y_2 - 1 - x_1 - \frac{ty_1}{m})\frac{ty_1}{m} \\
\equiv\ &x_2 y_1 + (y_2 - x_1 - \frac{ty_1}{m})\frac{ty_1}{m} + \mu(y_1) \pmod{p^{\alpha-\delta}} \qquad \text{(by (38))} \\
=\ &\frac{y_1}{m}(mx_2 + ty_2 - tx_1 - \frac{ty_1}{m}t) \equiv \mu(y_1) \pmod{p^{\alpha-\delta}} \qquad \text{(by (30))},
\end{aligned}$$

which results in (31).

(iii-2) If $2 \nmid y_1$, then $\delta, \gamma \geq \beta$, hence $2\delta \geq \alpha$. By Lemma 2.2 (II), $r^u \equiv 1 + (r-1)u \pmod{2^\alpha}$ for any $u \geq 0$, hence $(9)_2$ and $(10)_2$ become

$$ty_2 + m(1 + 2^{\delta-1}y_2)x_2 \equiv \frac{ty_1}{m}t + t(1 + 2^{\delta-1})x_1 \pmod{2^\alpha}, \tag{39}$$

$$(y_2 - 1)x_1 \equiv x_2 y_1 + \frac{ty_1}{m} + 2^{\delta-1}x_1 \pmod{2^{\alpha-\delta}}. \tag{40}$$

If $\gamma = \beta$, then $2 \mid x_1$ by (33), and $2 \nmid x_2$ by (20), hence $2 \mid y_2$ by (39). We can reduce (39) to (30), and reduce (40) to (31) in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 2.7.

Now assume $\gamma > \beta$. Using $\gamma + \delta - 1 \geq \beta + \delta \geq \alpha$, we can reduce (39) to (30) via multiplying by $1 - 2^{\delta-1}y_2$. Note that $\delta - 1 + \deg(x_1) < \alpha - \delta$ if and only if $\deg(x_1) = 0$ and $\alpha = 2\delta$; these two conditions are equivalent to (37), since $\alpha = 2\delta$ if and only if $\beta = \delta = \alpha - \delta$. When (37) holds, we can, similarly as in (iii-1), reduce (40) to $y_2 - 1 \equiv ty_1/m + 2^{\alpha-\delta-1} \pmod{2^\alpha}$; otherwise, we get $y_2 - 1 \equiv ty_1/m \pmod{2^\alpha}$. This also proves (31). □

2.5 Main result

Let m_0 be the smallest positive integer k such that $r^k \equiv 1 \pmod{p^{\alpha_p}}$ for all $p \in \Lambda_2$.

Combining Lemma 2.4, Lemma 2.5, Remark 2.6, Lemma 2.7 and Lemma 2.8, we have

Theorem 2.9. *Each automorphism of $H(n,m;t,r)$ is given by*

$$\sigma_{x_1,x_2;y_1,y_2}:\ a^u b^v \mapsto \exp_a(x_1[u]_{r^{y_1}} + r^{y_1 u} x_2 [v]_{r^{y_2}}) b^{y_1 u + y_2 v}, \quad u, v \geq 0,$$

for a unique quadruple (x_1,x_2,y_1,y_2) with $0 \leq x_1, x_2 < n$, $0 \leq y_1, y_2 < m$ and such that

(i) *for all $p \in \Lambda$,*

$$\begin{cases} p \nmid y_2, & p \in \Lambda', \\ p \nmid x_1, & p \in \Lambda_2 \text{ or } p \in \Lambda_1 \text{ with } \beta_p = 0, \\ p \nmid x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1, & p \in \Lambda_1 \text{ with } \beta_p > 0; \end{cases}$$

(ii) *$m \mid (d,t)y_1$, $m_0 \mid y_1, y_2 - 1$;*

(iii) *for all $p \in \Lambda_1$ with $p \neq 2$,*

$$m x_2 \equiv t(x_1 + \frac{t y_1}{m} - y_2) \pmod{p^{\alpha_p}}, \qquad y_2 \equiv 1 + \frac{t y_1}{m} \pmod{p^{\alpha_p - \delta_p}};$$

(iv) *if $2 \in \Lambda_1$ with $\delta_2 > 1$ or $\delta_2 = \alpha_2 = 1$, then*

$$m x_2 \equiv t(x_1 + \frac{t y_1}{m} - y_2) \pmod{2^{\alpha_2}}, \qquad y_2 \equiv 1 + \frac{t y_1}{m} + \mu(y_1) \pmod{2^{\alpha_2 - \delta_2}};$$

(v) *if $2 \in \Lambda_1$ with $\delta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$, $\alpha_2 = 2$ and $\beta_2 > 1$, then $\deg_2(y_1) \geq \beta_2$.*

(vi) *if $2 \in \Lambda_1$ with $\delta_2 = 1$, $\alpha_2 > 1$ and $\gamma_2 > 1$, then*

$$2 \mid y_1, \qquad \deg_2(x_2) \geq \alpha_2 - \beta_2 - \epsilon + 1, \qquad 2^{\epsilon}(y_1 - y_2 + 1) \equiv 2 t y_1 / m \pmod{2^{\alpha_2}}.$$

It is possible to derive a formula for the order of $\mathrm{Aut}(H(n,m;t,r))$, but we prefer not to do so, as it is just a boring job leading to nothing essentially new; instead, we give an example to illustrate how to enumerate the automorphisms.

Example 2.10. Let $n = 228, m = 30, t = 38, r = 7$, then (2) is satisfied. We have

$$\begin{gathered} d = 6, \quad \Lambda_1 = \{2,3\}, \quad \Lambda_2 = \{19\}, \quad \Lambda' = \{5\}, \quad m_0 = 3, \\ (\alpha_2,\beta_2,\gamma_2,\delta_2) = (2,1,1,1), \qquad (\alpha_3,\beta_3,\gamma_3,\delta_3) = (1,1,0,1), \\ (\alpha_{19},\beta_{19},\gamma_{19},\delta_{19}) = (1,0,1,0), \qquad \beta_5 = 1. \end{gathered}$$

By Theorem 2.9, each automorphism of $H(228,30;38,7)$ is determined by a unique quadruple (x_1,x_2,y_1,y_2) with $0 \leq x_1, x_2 < 228$, $0 \leq y_1, y_2 < 30$ and

(i) $5 \nmid y_2$, $19 \nmid x_1$, $2 \nmid x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1$, $3 \nmid x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1$;

(ii) $15 \mid y_1$, $3 \mid y_2 - 1$;

(iii) $x_1 + 38y_1/30 \equiv y_2 \pmod 3$.

Thus either

- $y_1 = 0$, $y_2 \in \{1, 7, 13, 19\}$, $x_1 \in \{1, 7, \ldots, 223\} \backslash \{19, 133\}$, or
- $y_1 = 15$, $y_2 \in \{1, 4, \ldots, 28\} \backslash \{10, 25\}$, $x_1 \in \{0, 3, \ldots, 225\} \backslash \{0, 57, 114, 171\}$, $x_2 \equiv x_1y_2 + 1 \pmod 2$.

There are $4 \times 36 \times 228 + 8 \times 72 \times 114 = 98496$ in total. We have checked this result with GAP.

References

[1] J.N.S. Bidwell, M.J. Curran: *The automorphism group of a split metacyclic p-group*. Arch. Math. 87 (2006), 488–497.

[2] M.J. Curran: *The automorphism group of a split metacyclic 2-group*. Arch. Math. 89 (2007), 10–23.

[3] M.J. Curran: *The automorphism group of a nonsplit metacyclic p-group*. Arch. Math. 90 (2008), 483–489.

[4] R.M. Davitt: *The automorphism group of a finite metacyclic p-group*. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society. 25 (1970), 876–879.

[5] M. Golasiński, D.L. Gonçalves: *On automorphisms of split metacyclic groups*. Manuscripta Math. 128 (2009), 251–273.

[6] C.E. Hempel: *Metacyclic groups*. Communications in Algebra, 28 (2000), no. 8, 3865–3897.

[7] C.J. Hillar, D.L. Rhea: *Automorphisms of finite abelian groups*. The American Mathematical Monthly 114 (2007), 917–923.

[8] H.J. Zassenhaus: *The theory of groups*. Second edition, Chelsea, New York, 1956.